

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

07 February 2018

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Goldschmidt, N. (2017) 'Textual monuments : reconstructing Carthage in Augustan literary culture.', *Classical philology*, 112 (3). pp. 368-383.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1086/692621>

Publisher's copyright statement:

© 2017 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

Additional information:

Special Issue, Carthage and Rome, edited by Denis Feeney

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

TEXTUAL MONUMENTS: RECONSTRUCTING CARTHAGE IN AUGUSTAN LITERARY CULTURE

NORA GOLDSCHMIDT

RECONSTRUCTING CARTHAGE

AFTER THE BATTLE OF Naulochus in 36 BCE, a naval column was erected in the Roman forum in Octavian's honor, decorated with the prows of captured ships and topped with a gilded honorific statue. Visually, this column openly echoed another naval column situated nearby: that of Gaius Duilius, the hero of the First Punic War, commemorating his victory at the Battle of Mylae, fought some two centuries earlier in roughly the same stretch of sea as Octavian's victory.¹ A statue of Duilius was later incorporated into the gallery of *summi viri* in the Forum Augusti, accompanied by an *elogium* mentioning Duilius' column, and it is likely that it was under Augustus, too, that the Duilius monument was "restored," complete with a revamped inscription (re)carved on lunar marble, and featuring archaic orthography.² The two naval victories were thus commemorated in parallel in the memorial landscape of Rome: one gilded, polished, new; the other constructedly archaic. Harnessing the spatial politics of memory by situating the statues in deliberately close proximity to one another, Augustus located his victory in a line of succession from the heroes of the Punic Wars, seemingly not merely echoing their success, but improving it in gilded splendor. The same strategy could be seen in the Forum Augusti, where the known figures in the gallery included not just Duilius, but M. Claudius Marcellus, Q. Fabius Maximus "Cunctator," and Scipio Aemilianus.

Even as he was giving space to the heroes of the Punic Wars in the memorial landscape of Rome, Octavian/Augustus was also engaged in another "reconstruction": that of the city of Carthage. Around 29 BCE, the year Virgil is said to have

1. See *RIC* 12 271 for the likely depiction of the monument. For the semiotic connections between the two honorific statues, see Roller 2009 and 2013; Biggs forthcoming. Roller (2013, 221–22) highlights the contiguities both on land (the position of the *rostratae* in close proximity in the heart of Rome), and at sea (Naulochus and Mylae are under fifteen kilometers apart on the Sicilian coast).

2. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 31.5: *proximum a dis immortalibus honorem memoriae ducum praestitit, qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent. itaque et opera cuiusque manentibus titulis restituit*. For Duilius' rostral inscription, see *CIL* I² 25 = *CIL* 6.1300 (cf. 6.31591; 6.37040) = *ILS* 65 = *ILLRP* 319 = *InscrIt* 13.3.69; for the Forum Augusti *elogium*, see *CIL* 6.40952, with Kondratieff 2004, 11 n. 40. Scholars have increasingly moved toward an Augustan date for the contested inscription, viewing it convincingly within the wider context of Augustan restoration of the "archaic" past: see esp. Roller 2013, 122, with further bibliography; cf. also Biggs forthcoming on the intertextual connections between the inscription and the *elogium* in the Forum Augusti. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.49), Augustus also restored the temple of Janus in the Forum Holitorium, built by Duilius after the victory at Mylae: Roller 2013, 123.

started work on the *Aeneid*, the soon-to-be *princeps* turned his attention to “thirsty Africa” (*sitientis Afros*, *Ecl.* 1.64) with the Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago. Ever since it had been destroyed by the younger Scipio Africanus, the threat of *Carthago delenda* had long turned into the fact of *Carthago deleta*. The destruction of Carthage, together with the parallel destruction of Corinth in the same year, was a remarkable act, carefully orchestrated by manipulating the existing ideological language of total urban obliteration in order to put Rome on the map as the major power in the Mediterranean.³ Aiming to succeed where the Gracchan colony had failed, this new colony, instigated by Caesar but primarily executed by Augustus, in line with the broader Augustan cultural revolution, deliberately combined the old with the new.⁴ The *Byrsa* was famously leveled, with 100,000 cubic meters of earth removed to make way for a very Roman complex of monumental buildings in a “consciously undertaken eradication of the physical topography of Punic Carthage.”⁵ But this new-old Carthage also incorporated ancient Punic elements. It was built on the site of the old city, in Pliny’s words, *colonia Carthago magnae in vestigiis Carthaginis*;⁶ the whole orientation deliberately reverted to the scheme set out in the archaic Punic period, like Dido’s city following the line of the coast on the orthogonal plan; the alignment of the walls of Punic buildings was also copied, and building materials were reused.⁷ The colony at Carthage, in other words, can be seen as a “reconstruction” in a truly Augustan vein, combining the ambitions of radical marble modernity with the foundation brick of fabled antiquity. The “undead city” of Dido and Hannibal and the wars it fought with Rome were once again front and center in Augustan memory culture.⁸

The Augustan “reconstruction” of Carthage and the heroes of the Punic Wars in material terms finds its corollary in the period’s literary culture. The Punic Wars had been over for more than a century, but Roman writers turned again and again to the hostile city of Carthage and the generation that “stained the sea with Punic blood . . . and laid dire Hannibal low.”⁹ Yet while the city of Carthage had been leveled to the ground and the commemoration of it in the physical landscape of Rome needed reconstruction, the central texts of the so-called “archaic” canon, whose principal concern was Punic subject matter, Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum*, and Ennius’ *Annales* and *Scipio*, were still powerfully exercising their memorial capacity as cultural productions in the memory landscape of Rome.

3. Purcell 1995.

4. For the archaeology of Augustan Carthage, see esp. Wightman 1980; Hurst 1985; Gros 1990; Rakob 2000; Miles 2003, 131–35. For the self-conscious combination of the archaic and the modern in the broad spectrum of cultural outputs in Augustan Rome, including the city’s architectural program, see Goldschmidt 2013, 38–39, with further references.

5. Miles 2003, 132, reacting against recent emphases on “Punic survivals” in Roman Carthage. For the building program, see esp. Gros 1990.

6. *HN* 5.4.24, though Appian erroneously claimed that Augustus had avoided the actual site of the city, building the colony nearby: *App. Pun.* 8.136.

7. Rakob 2000, 76–80. The Roman temple on the *Byrsa*, too, may have been built on the site of the old Punic one: Rakob 2000, 79.

8. For the “undead city” encoded in the Roman imagination in Cato’s famous words, *Carthago delenda est*, see O’Gorman 2004, 100–101. On Carthage in the Roman cultural imaginary more broadly, see also Beck 2006; Bücher 2006, 196–207; Brizzi 2011; Goldschmidt 2013, 101–48.

9. *Hor. Carm.* 3.6.33–6: *infecit aequor sanguine Punico / . . . cecidit . . . / Hannibalem . . . dirum*.

This paper focuses on the ways in which three Augustan authors, Horace, Virgil, and Livy, responded to Carthage and the Punic Wars. It argues that, faced, on the one hand, with competition from the “restored” physical memorial landmarks at home and abroad, and, on the other, with the textual monuments of the archaic canon, these authors construct textual *monumenta* that aim to reclaim Rome’s Punic past and re-inscribe it onto the collective consciousness of their Roman audiences. Taking on the role of “reminders,” these *monumenta* also self-consciously assimilate to the condition of the physical monument, engaging in a textual “Punic War” of their own, pitched against the lapidary works of Naevius, and especially Ennius, the fragments of whose work display analogous preoccupations.¹⁰

1. HORACE *AERE PER-ENNIUS*

Horace famously ended his third book of *Odes* with the claim that he had set up a monument “more enduring than bronze” (*aere perennius*, 3.30.1), or, with a pun on Ennius’ name, *aere per-Ennius*, more enduring than Ennius.¹¹ In “including a reference to bronze letters—names on pyramids, mausolea and the like,”¹² at the same time, Horace also pitches the commemorative power of poetry against the physical reality of public memorial culture. As literature aiming to commemorate the past in the era of Augustus’ *Macht der Bilder*, poetry implicitly faces competition on two fronts: the so-called archaic canon (notably Ennius’ *Annales*, which Rome “learned by heart”: *hos ediscit . . . Roma*, Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.60–61), and the rich culture of memory in the Augustan built environment.

The twin competitors of physical memory media and Ennius’ poetry of memory are reprised more explicitly in the specific context of the Punic Wars in *Ode* 4.8, the “metapoem of the book” (*Carm.* 4.8.13–20):¹³

non incisa notis marmora publicis,
per quae spiritus et vita redit bonis
post mortem ducibus, non celeres fugae
relictæque retrorsum Hannibalis minae,
non incendia Carthaginis impiae
eius, qui domita nomen ab Africa
lucratus rediit, clarius indicant
laudes quam Calabrae Pierides.

Not marble inscribed with public records, through which the breath of life returns to worthy leaders after death, nor the quick retreat of Hannibal and his threats hurled back on himself, nor the burning of wicked Carthage, declare more gloriously the fame of him who came back home, having acquired his name from Africa’s subjection, than do the Muses of Calabria.

10. OLD, s.v. *monumentum*: 3a “anything which serves as a commemoration, a memorial”; 3b “a token, reminder; an example.” For the text as *monumentum*, see esp. Jaeger 1997. Cf. Suerbaum 1968, 327–28 (Appendix 32) for the philological evidence on poetry as *monumentum* (the metaphorical use of the word for “poetry” appears to go back at least to Lucilius 1084 Marx).

11. Cf. the famous concealed pun on Ennius’ name at Lucr. 1.117–18. The wordplay may have originally been made by Ennius himself: Hardie 2012, 478 n. 105. On Horace and Ennius, cf. esp. Suerbaum 1968, 98–101, 165–72, 243–47; Prinzen 1998, 245–56; Hills 2001.

12. A. Barchiesi 1996, 18.

13. Thomas 2011, 186.

Like *Ode* 3.30, *non incisa notis marmora publicis* (4.8.13) sets public inscriptional culture against oral and literary culture, while line 20, *Calabrae Pierides*, all but names Ennius (from Rudiae in Calabria). Despite its crucial position “functioning as both prologue and epilogue” to *Odes* 4, however, this seems at first like an “odd poem,” as Kenneth Quinn calls it—suggesting that Horace must have left it in draft form by mistake.¹⁴ Its style is clunky by Horatian standards, more like prose, or indeed early Roman poetry, and it seems as if the ode is trying to sound either like an inscription, or like a rough-around-the-edges archaic poet, or both. The seemingly slapdash text has been energetically disputed. In particular, editors cast suspicion on 17, “a troubling line” (Thomas), “von einem Ignoranten . . . interpoliert” (Kiessling-Heinze), which lacks a caesura and sits uneasily with narrative history, since it tells of something the poet of Calabria was not around to witness (the destruction of Carthage) and seems to conflate the two Scipiones, the elder Africanus, subject of Ennius’ poetry, and the younger Africanus (Scipio Aemilianus), who destroyed Carthage in 146 BCE, well after Ennius’ death.¹⁵ As Stephen Harrison appealingly suggests, however, lines 15–19 can in fact be understood as the words of the *marmora incisa* themselves, giving the sense of “it is not public inscriptions or their recording of routs and of the defeat of Hannibal’s threats which have made Scipio famous, but the poems of Ennius” (my emphasis).¹⁶ Lines 13–19 read like an inscribed list of military achievements on a memorial: *fugae / reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae* sounds like a colorful version of an epigraphic formula marking military achievements, and the metrical clunkiness of 17 and un-Horatian *eius* at 18 would not be out of place on an inscription. In fact, as Harrison notes, this pseudo-inscriptional list of Punic victories reads significantly like the inscription on Duilius’ naval column in Rome.¹⁷

In linking the Muses of Calabria and Punic subject matter with the durability of poetry as contrasted with physical memory markers, *Ode* 4.8, for Horace’s initial audience, would have evoked Ennius’ own statements about the memorial power of stone.¹⁸ As Thomas Biggs points out in this special issue, in the incipient phase of Roman poetry, Naevius and Ennius faced their main competition as Rome’s self-appointed commemorators not from the relatively few other Roman texts, but from non-literary media, including Duilius’ original naval column.¹⁹ Ennius, in particular, seems to have been overtly self-conscious of this fact, and a number of fragments cited by a variety of sources suggest a strong preoccupation with competing physical memory media: *reges per regnum statuasque sepulchraque quaerunt, / aedificant nomen, summa nituntur opum vi* (“Kings throughout

14. Thomas 2011, 186; Quinn 1980, ad loc.

15. Thomas 2011, 191; Kiessling and Heinze 1958, ad loc. For a similar conflation of the two Scipiones by Horace in a potentially Ennian context, see *Epod.* 9.25–26 on Africanus, *cui super Carthaginem / virtus sepulchrum condidit*, which can be read either as Africanus the Elder, “whose valor erected a memorial to himself over Carthage,” the “memorial” being Ennius’ celebration of the elder Africanus (so, e.g., Bentley) or as Africanus the Younger, “whose valor established a memorial over Carthage” (i.e., turned the city into a graveyard when it was destroyed by Scipio Aemilianus) (so, e.g., Watson 2003, ad loc.).

16. S. J. Harrison 1990, endorsed by Thomas 2011, 190.

17. S. J. Harrison 1990.

18. Suerbaum 1968, 242–48.

19. On the multiform nature of memory culture in Republican Rome, see further Walter 2004; Hölkeskamp 2006.

their reign seek statues and tombs; they build up a name and strain with all their power,” *Ann.* 404–5), is attested for *Annales* 16, a book we know featured overt self-construction in the poet’s voice, and may have formed part of the poet’s self-fashioning, perhaps connected with fragment 406 (*postremo longinqua dies confecerit aetas*, “in the end, the long age of days will destroy . . .”) in comparing the ephemerality of *statuasque sepulchraque* with the epic *monumentum* itself.²⁰

But perhaps more crucial than *Annales* 16 on *bella recentia* was Ennius’ *Scipio*, his poem about the statesman who acquired his name *domita . . . ab Africa* in the Second Punic War. Ennius was closely connected with Scipio in antiquity: the *Annales* were interpreted early on as containing an extensive embedded self-portrait of their relationship;²¹ Ennius is mentioned primarily in connection with Scipio in the *Suda*,²² and Horace and his contemporaries believed that the poet’s body had been laid to rest in Scipio’s family tomb, the poet’s *corpus* merging with the general’s *monumentum* in the memorial landscape of Rome (although even they were not quite sure, the marble having lost its memorial capacity over the age of days).²³ Moreover, it is probably in this work that Ennius made comparisons between poetry and physical memorial culture (*var.* 1 Vahlen = *op. inc.* 3 Skutsch = 30 Courtney).²⁴

quantam statuam statuet populus Romanus,
quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas loquatur?

How great a statue will the Roman people erect,
How great a column to speak of your deeds?

Monuments are envisaged as “speaking” (*loquatur*) of the deeds they commemorate, and therefore set in implicit competition with the incipient literary culture of Republican Rome as memorializers of *res gestae*. The statement is made *de Scipione*, as the citing source indicates, but who is making it and in what context is unclear. Otto Skutsch and Johannes Vahlen both thought that it must have been spoken in the poet’s voice as part of a preface or epilogue.²⁵ If the fragment is envisaged as spoken by a character, another possible context might be Scipio’s famous but historically contentious speech in the senate refusing statues of himself (Livy 38.56.12).²⁶ In either case, the physical *columna* for Scipio never materialized: what did materialize was Ennius’ poetry, the *Annales* and the *Scipio*,

20. The collocation of the fragments is made by both Vahlen (1903, frags. 411–12; 413) and Skutsch (1985).

21. *Ann.* 268–86 identified by the influential critic Aelius Stilo (fl. ca. 110–85 BCE) as an embedded self-portrait of the poet: Gell. 12.4.5.

22. E 1348, p. 2.285 Adler.

23. *putatur* (Cic. *Arch.* 22); *dicuntur* (Livy 38.56.4); cf. also Ov. *Ars* 3.409–10; Val. Max. 8.14.1. For the putative tomb in the later cultural economy of Rome, see Martelli forthcoming.

24. The citing source for the fragment, the *Historia Augusta* (written ca. 400 CE) introduces the fragment with the words *dicunt Ennius de Scipione*: there is a chance that it is from the portion of the *Annales* dealing with the same material, since several alterations are required to produce either dactylic or dialogue meter (Skutsch [1985, 753] sees “no strong argument against attributing the fragment to the *Scipio*”); for strong arguments for assigning the fragment to the *Scipio*, see Russo 2007, 211–17; Courtney 1993, 26–27 (noting marked traces of trochaic rhythm).

25. Vahlen (1903, 213) thought the fragment was part of a proem in the poet’s voice; Skutsch (1985, 753) that it was part of a conclusion (“the poet’s own encomium, perhaps concluding the *Scipio*”).

26. Courtney 1993, 26; Skutsch (1985, 753) dismissed this context as “a fabrication of the time just before Caesar’s murder”; for a more sympathetic review of the evidence, see Russo 2007, 214–16.

which, by implication, come out as the true and lasting *monumenta* to Scipio's Punic *res gestae*.²⁷

Ennius' poetry, then, was implicitly or explicitly lauded in this fragment as more enduring than marble. Yet, if we read Horace's lines as recapping the words of the stone memorials rather than the Ennian text, 4.8 undercuts precisely Ennius' own statements about poetic durability. Instead of rehearsing the content of Ennius' poetry, which should be more enduring than inscribed stone, Horace instead seems to recap the content of the public memorials with which it competes for a place in Roman memory. Moreover, in failing to narrate the destruction of Carthage, so 4.8 suggests, Ennius' poetry is fatally limited: a narrative poem like the *Annales* necessarily has to stop with the death of the poet, but Roman history—as the younger Scipio's destruction of Carthage attests (4.8.17)—goes on. When it comes to Ennius' poetic output, as memory-carriers, the physical *monumenta* come up trumps, while Ennius' own papyri remain silent (*si chartae sileant*, 4.8.21).²⁸ Horace is therefore able simultaneously to exploit Ennius' authority as precedent in his claims for poetry against other kinds of *memoria* in Augustus' cultural revolution, while turning the tables on the "archaic" poet to suggest the time-bound nature of his work.

At the end of *Odes* 4, Horace evokes another *monumentum* in the heart of Rome, when, in a prominently Ennian context, Augustus (the real hero of the collection) closes the Gates of War opened at the start of the Punic books of the *Annales* and which should (according to Silius Italicus) have been closed at the end of the Second Punic War (*Pun.* 17.356).²⁹ Ennius and Naevius may have witnessed the clash of civilizations in the two Punic Wars, "when the whole world, shaken by the terrifying tumult of war, trembled, shuddering under the high shores of heaven" (Lucr. 3.834–35, echoing Ennius),³⁰ but only Horace and his contemporaries can see through to the end of history in Augustan Rome. It is only for and under Augustus, not Scipio Africanus, whom Augustus far outshines (*Epod.* 9.25–26), that a truly lasting textual monument can be constructed.³¹

2. VIRGIL'S WRITTEN CARTHAGE

In the proem in the middle of the *Georgics*, Virgil looks forward to the epic he will one day write. Sharing Horace's and Ennius' preoccupation with physical

27. For *res gestae* engendering *monumenta*, cf. var. 7 Vahlen = Skutsch *op. inc.* 7 (but probably from the *Annales*: Courtney 1993, 26), *nam tibi moenimenta mei peperere labores* ("For my efforts have produced monuments for you"), spoken by Scipio Africanus to Rome, as the citation context makes clear (Skutsch 1985, 754). For statues, cf. also *Ann.* 579: *huic statuum statui maiorum forbatur athenis*: corrupt, but for Skutsch "the thought would . . . be similar to the *exegi monumentum* idea" (1985, 719); cf. Suerbaum 1968, 246–48. Cf. also *Enn. Euhem.* 7 for Jupiter's *sempiterna monumenta*.

28. For another Augustan "completion" of the content of Ennius' *Annales*, cf. Prop. 3.3.8.

29. *Hor. Carm.* 4.15.8–9: *vacuum duellis / Ianum Quirini clausit*; the highly archaic form of *bellum* is a deliberately Ennian archaism (*Ann.* 573); Ennius' lines on the Gates of War (*Ann.* 225–26) had been quoted by Horace earlier in his career as an example of indestructible poetry at *Sat.* 1.4.60–61, an indestructibility to which he now aspires himself.

30. *omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu / horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris*; cf. *Ann.* 309: *Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu* ("the land of Africa trembled, shuddering with the terrible tumult").

31. Though even Augustan poets had their doubts in linking the durability of their poetry with the physical solidity of Augustan Rome and its empire: see Hardie 1992.

memorials, he employs the metaphor of a marble temple to describe his future epic project (*G.* 3.13–16):

et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam . . .
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit.

And on the green plain I will erect a marble temple beside the water . . . In the middle, I will have Caesar, and he will possess the shrine . . .

In this metaphorical temple of poetry, Virgil famously takes on Ennius, claiming to be the “first” to bring Greece to Rome and “fly on the lips of men” (*virum volitare per ora*, *G.* 3.9), quoting Ennius’ auto-epitaph (written as if for a monument, though perhaps never inscribed on one), *volito vivos per ora virum* (*var.* 17–18 Vahlen = 46 Courtney). Commentators have attempted to draw parallels between Virgil’s temple and Skutsch’s highly speculative reconstruction of an episode at the end of Book 15 of the *Annales* involving Fulvius Nobilior’s *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, seeing it as part of a contest between the two poets over the introduction of the cultural goods of Greece to Rome.³² There is evidently a contest at play here with the *Aeneid*’s early Roman epic predecessors, but it is fought not primarily over the transference of cultural tradition from the Greek world, but over the monumental commemoration of Roman historical culture. On the doors of the temple will be naval victory (*G.* 3.26–29):

in foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto
Gangaridum faciam victorisque arma Quirini,
atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem
Nilum ac navali surgentis aere columnas.

On the doors I will make in solid gold and ivory the battle of the Ganges-dwellers and the arms of conquering Quirinus; there, too, the Nile in full flood billowing with war, and rising columns with bronze prows.

The image of Actium is repeated later on the shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8, a kind of ekphrastic version of the Roman historical epic Virgil never wrote, depicting Caesar at Actium quite literally *in medio* (*in medio classis aeratas* at *Aen.* 8.675 will echo *in medio* here). The image of rostral columns (*navali surgentis aere columnas*, 29), meanwhile, as the Servian commentary implies, evokes the visible urban landscape of Augustan Rome, which made implicit visual analogies between Octavian’s victory and Roman naval success in the First Punic War.³³ The *Aeneid* deploys strikingly similar spatial politics to the *rostratae* in the Forum. The territory of the poem’s epic predecessors, Sicily is a memory landscape not just of recent history—notably Naulochus³⁴—but of the First Punic War, where the Aeneadae engage in a proto-Punic ship-race which takes place, like the contiguous victories of Octavian and Duilius, in the very waters in which

32. Hardie 1986, 49 n. 39; Hinds 1998, 62–63; Fabrizi 2008. Cf. Heslin 2015, 257–60 for multimedia intertexts with the rebuilt temple in Augustan Rome.

33. Cf. Servius and DServius on *G.* 3.29, linking the passage explicitly with Augustus’ naval monument (*columnas dicit, quae in honore Augusti et Agrippae rostratae constitutae sunt*) and implicitly with Duilius’ (*nam rostratas Duilius posuit, victis Poenis navali certamine*).

34. Powell 2008, 87–131.

the past-future wars would be fought. A memory landscape of Roman history, Virgil's Italy, too, echoes a major theater of the Second Punic War: a war, as Livy put it, fought in Italy *pro moenibus Romanis*.³⁵

Virgil's Carthage likewise functions as an intensely mnemotopic landscape of the Punic past, a city of memory as well as a city full of monuments. But it is also a mnemotopic landscape of present geopolitics. The key passage appears in Book 1, as Augustus' designated predecessor catches his first glimpse of the city (*Aen.* 1.418–29):

corripuere viam interea, qua semita monstrat.
iamque ascendebant collem, qui plurimus urbi
imminet, adversasque adspectat desuper arces.
miratur molem Aeneas, magalia quondam,
miratur portas strepitumque et strata viarum.
instant ardentem Tyrii: pars ducere muros,
molirique arcem et manibus subvolvere saxa,
pars optare locum tecto et concludere sulco.
iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum;
hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris
fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora apta futuris.

Meanwhile they sped on the road where the pathway points. And now they were climbing the hill that looms large over the city and looks down on the confronting towers. Aeneas marvels at the massive buildings, just mud huts once; he marvels at the gates, the din, and paved streets. Eagerly the Tyrians press on, some to build the walls, labor at rearing the citadel, and heave up stones, some to choose the site for a dwelling and enclose it with a furrow. Here some were digging harbors, here others were laying the deep foundations for a theater and cutting out huge columns from the rocks, adornments fit for a future stage.

This passage has been central to the interpretation of Carthage and Rome in the *Aeneid* as twin cities. This strikingly familiar city has paved streets (*strata viarum* 1.422), theaters (*theatris*, 1.42), and a senate (*sanctumque senatum* 1.426), while its founder, Dido, is self-consciously, even incestuously, twinned through the symbolic imagery of the poem with Aeneas, the proto-founder of Rome.³⁶

At the same time, Carthage is also the ghost-twin of Rome's prototype, Troy. Like Troy, Carthage in the Roman imaginary is a city always already annihilated (*fuit*, *Aen.* 1.12);³⁷ we first glimpse the city panoramically from above (*desuper*, 420), like a general perhaps about to destroy it, and leave it in flames (*Aen.* 5.4).³⁸ But like Virgil's Troy, too, the city refuses to stay down. Scipio

35. Livy 21.16: *bellum gerendum in Italia ac pro moenibus Romanis*. For full discussion, see Goldschmidt 2013, 101–48.

36. See, e.g., Reed 2007, 88 on how “Carthage melds into Rome” and Giusti forthcoming on Dido's city as a specular image of the city on the Tiber; on Dido and Aeneas as twins (a possibility already noted in D. Serv. ad *Aen.* 4.144), see Hardie 2006.

37. As Purcell (1995, 133) puts it, “sacks were normal: wholesale destruction evoked Nineveh, Miletus, King Xerxes at Athens, and, above all, Troy.” For Carthage as a city bound up in Roman culture with destruction, see O’Gorman 2004.

38. Cf. Livy's description of Marcellus *ex superioribus locis* as he weeps before the destruction of Syracuse (25.24.11–15); Rossi (2000) links the episode with the more famous example of Scipio Aemilianus' tears over Carthage.

Aemilianus anecdotally ploughed salt into the earth, thereby reversing the foundation act of marking out land with a furrow (an act in which Virgil's Aeneas is implicated by laying out the *fundamenta* of Carthage with his own hands, 4.265–66).³⁹ But, as later authors would stress, the city kept threatening to rise again.⁴⁰ The Gracchan colony of 122 BCE (as rumor had it) was narrowly foiled at its inception by wolves, symbols through their association with the Romulus legend of Roman foundation;⁴¹ Julius Caesar instigated and perhaps started work on a new colony, and under Augustus that colony, Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago, was built in earnest.⁴²

In a now rather neglected article, E. L. Harrison brought to the fore the suggestion that *Aeneid* 1.418–29 would have been read by Virgil's audience as, at least partly, a representation of the building of that colony in Carthage.⁴³ For Harrison, the depiction in the *Aeneid* of Carthage as a city under construction would have been an “extraordinary manoeuvre,” throwing up a number of otherwise unnecessary narrative inconsistencies: most of the Dido-plot, her history with Sychaeus, her experience of numerous suitors in the vicinity, and her representation of Carthage to Aeneas “like some bare-faced estate agent” as a ready-made city when it patently was not, sits uneasily with the image of Carthage as a dusty city under construction in 1.418–29.⁴⁴ Scholarly discussion since has been largely archaeological, and has concerned itself primarily with the extent to which Virgil's Carthage constitutes a direct representation of what Augustus was doing in Africa.⁴⁵ Yet the geographical detail in Virgil's poem is never an archaeological blueprint.⁴⁶ The *Aeneid*'s landscape is, rather, a space in the mind, accurate above all in its mapping of Roman memory culture rather than a guide to physical reality. Virgil's Carthage, in other words, is clearly a corollary to the politics of urban development that coincides with Augustus' restoration of Carthage, and should be read as part of the semiotics of Roman memory at work in the *Aeneid*.

Yet just as the archaeological site reveals Augustus' new Carthage to be based partly on the incorporation and appropriation of ancient Punic memories in its fabric and layout, so, too, the literary archaeology of Virgil's new epic reveals traces of the old poets who were on this site first. Like Juno's temple, in which murals depicting scenes from the Trojan War function in part as metapoetic representations *in nuce* of the epic cycle, the monuments-in-progress which constitute Aeneas' first glimpse of the city function as mnemonics of the past poetry, and of Naevius and Ennius in particular, who had told the story of the soil on

39. For Aeneas' obsessive re-foundation of Troy around the Mediterranean, see Quint 1993, 53–65.

40. See Miles in this special issue.

41. App. *Pun.* 8.20.136.

42. Unlike Virgil's new Troy (Rome) (*occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*, *Aen.* 12.828), Augustus' Carthage symbolically gets to keep its ancient name.

43. E. L. Harrison 1984. For earlier suggestions, cf. Carcopino 1919, 751; Deman 1962.

44. E. L. Harrison 1984, 101, 102. Harrison is primarily interested in refuting the historical validity of Scipio's curse, and goes on to make the (then-crucial) argument for the larger global importance of the Punic Wars in the *Aeneid*.

45. See esp. Gros 1990, 570 with n. 8; Rakob 2000, 75. Cf. Galinsky 2009, 82.

46. Horsfall 1985.

which Aeneas stands.⁴⁷ For Virgil's readers, Carthage in Roman epic is Naevian and Ennian territory. Whether or not a proto-Virgilian Aeneas came into contact with Dido and her city in the *Bellum Punicum*, Naevius' narrative of Regulus' invasion of Africa during the First Punic War would have been set in the vicinity of Carthage,⁴⁸ and the city and its territory provided a similarly crucial backdrop to Ennius' *Annales* Books 7–9 and *Scipio*. Like Horace, Virgil is able to see beyond the chronological scope of the *Annales* and *Scipio* to the destruction and reconstruction of the city, but that city is a palimpsest of literary and historical memory.

Carthage, then, is a “site of memory” evoking both present Roman activity in Carthage and the historical past and the poems which told its story. In this context, the theater imagery becomes particularly significant. As scholars have noted, Virgil's Carthage is heavily laden with theatrical imagery. The *scaena* (1.64) in which Aeneas and his men make safe landing (1.159–69) sets up the city as a stage (a stage to which Virgil already looks forward in the *Georgics* 3 proem).⁴⁹ Significantly singled out in particular detail among the work-in-progress of the old-new colonists is a theater (*Aen.* 1.427–29):

hic alta theatris
fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora apta futuris.

Here others were laying the deep foundations for a theater and cutting out huge columns
from the rocks, adornments fit for a future stage.

As archaeologists note, there are no known traces of an Augustan theater in Carthage.⁵⁰ Along with other theatrical imagery, and in a landscape whose other monuments have clear metaliterary meaning, this theater also functions as an Alexandrian footnote marking out the allusive nexus of the poem. Most scholars associate its presence with the dense intertextual connections to tragedy in Books 1 and 4.⁵¹ Some of that tragic nexus of allusion encompasses Latin versions of Greek originals, notably by Ennius himself.⁵² But the *Annales*, too, a hexameter epic written by a prolific tragic poet, are themselves marked by “generic enrichment” through intertextual connections to tragedy.⁵³ Ennius has clearly left detectable traces in the literary archaeology of Virgil's Carthage. Echoes of the tragedies

47. A. Barchiesi 1997. For multimedia intertext with another key new Augustan monument, the Portico of Philippus, see Heslin 2015, 261–78.

48. For the vexed issue of a speculative Dido episode in Naevius, see esp. M. Barchiesi 1962, 219–22, 477–82; Goldberg 1995, 54–55; Suerbaum 2002, 113–14. The episode is generally extrapolated from 17 Blänsdorf (a reported mention by Naevius of Dido and her sister Anna), and 20 Blänsdorf (*blande et docte percontat, Aeneia quo pacto / Troiam urbem reliquit*). For Dido in the *Annales*, see *Ann.* 297; Skutsch suggests that *Ann.* 461 may have referred to Dido's wanderings before reaching Carthage.

49. *G.* 3.24–25. See, e.g., Pobjoy 1998, 43. For echoes of Punic-Roman history in the Libyan harbor at *Aen.* 1.159–69, see recently Shi and Morgan (2015), who attempt to identify the harbor as an echo of Carthago Nova, suggesting Ennius' *Annales* as Virgil's probable source (pp. 12–14), though that material would have been part of the remit of the *Scipio* as well.

50. Rakob 2000, 75. Traces of a late-second-century-CE theater have been found, though Rakob speculates (partly on the basis of Virgil's text) that it might have been based on an earlier structure. The “real” Carthage also lacks Virgil's city wall: Rakob 2000, 75.

51. So, e.g., Pobjoy 1998, 43.

52. For Latin tragedy in the *Aeneid*, see esp. Stabryla 1970; cf. Mác Goráin 2013; Giusti 2014, chap. 2.

53. For tragic motifs in the *Annales*, see Krevans 1993 (on the *Ilia* fragment).

haunt the Dido episode, while linguistic traces of the *Annales* penetrate even the proto-colonial building works, where we find a *sanctus . . . senatus* (1.426), a self-consciously Ennian phrase (*Ann.* 272) to match the *pauper senatus* of Evander's intensely Ennian proto-Rome (*Aen.* 8.105).⁵⁴ Given the mnemotopics of Carthage in the *Aeneid*, moreover, other genres of early Latin poetry are likely to be at play here, too. Ennius' *Scipio*, which would have told of Scipio's African campaign, is an attractive candidate as one of the works that left its latent traces on Carthaginian soil for Virgil and his readers. Two of the securely cited fragments of the *Scipio* come through parallels made by Macrobius with the *Aeneid*, which suggests that ancient readers, at least, were making parallels between the two works, seeing the *Scipio* as a text relevant to the *Aeneid*'s allusive fabric.⁵⁵ The *Suda* seems to remember Ennius primarily for this work,⁵⁶ but little survives: only three fragments are explicitly cited from ancient sources, with a small handful of possible additions.⁵⁷ The *Scipio* is a scholarly enigma: even its genre, meter, and date of composition have long been disputed. Clearing the poem of supplements and speculatively attributed fragments, recent work has convincingly argued that it was probably written in trochaic septenarii: the meter of Latin drama.⁵⁸ In the hands of a poet who wrote drama extensively, including *praetextae* on recent events such as the *Ambracia* on Fulvius Nobilior's campaign, the *Scipio* could very conceivably, therefore, have been a *fabula praetexta*, a fundamentally important genre for Rome's historical commemoration.⁵⁹ The soil of Carthage in the *Aeneid*, in that case, would be a *scaena futura* not just because it is a theater of war, or an intertextual hotbed of tragedy, but a topic of early Roman epic and historical drama. When it comes to early Latin texts, Virgil's Carthage, like a city ploughed with salt, has lost much of its commemorative capacity. Yet, given the Punic preoccupations of Ennius' most enigmatic work, the content of Books 7–9 of the *Annales* and the textually staged competition on Punic themes already latent in Roman epic, behind Virgil's "new" textual monument to Carthage, as

54. For Ennian echoes in Books 1 and 4, see Stabryła 1970; Wigodsky 1972; Goldschmidt 2013, 197–99, 204, and passim; for Virgil's densely Ennian proto-Rome, see Goldschmidt 2013, 90–99, with further bibliography. *Aeneid* 1.426, despite full manuscript authority, has been deleted by some editors on the grounds that it fits uneasily in the passage. As Austin (1971, ad loc.) explains, the line is effectively deviant focalization from a Roman perspective, since it must refer to "nothing that Aeneas could see, but to what (from a Roman point of view) would come into his mind"; from a Roman point of view, one of the things that would come into his mind would be Ennius' work on Punic themes.

55. 31 Courtney = var. 9–12 Vahlen (Macrobius compares the calm of the nature before Jupiter speaks at *Aen.* 10.101–3 to a similar passage about the hush of wind and water at some critical moment in the *Scipio*), and 33 Courtney = var. 14 Vahlen (bristling spears) with *Aen.* 11.601, a comparison Servius also makes with the *Aeneid* (ad *Aen.* 11.601). As with the *Annales*, Macrobius relies for his citations of the *Scipio* from an earlier work, which would potentially limit the number of parallels he (and no doubt Servius) highlights.

56. E 1348, p. 2.285 Adler = frag. 29 Courtney = var. 1 Vahlen.

57. 31, 32, and 33 Courtney = var. 9–12, 13, and 14 Vahlen.

58. Courtney 1993, 26; Morgan 2014 (speculating that Ennius tapped into the popular form of the meter used for soldiers' chants). 33 Courtney has been seen as problematic; it can be read either as an incomplete trochaic septenarius (so, e.g., Courtney ad loc., with qualifications) or as a hexameter showing unusual patterns not attested elsewhere in Ennius (so, e.g., Russo 2007, 235–41); for a succinct summary of the scholarly debate, see Morgan 2014, n. 4. In any case, as Russo (2007, 202–3) notes, a hexameter in Ennian drama—and indeed in Ennian *praetexta*—would not be unusual in the company of trochaic septenarii: see sc. 292 and 367 (attested for the *Ambracia*) Vahlen², with Russo 2007, 202–3.

59. The hypothesis that the *Scipio* was a *praetexta* (first adduced in 1593) is usefully revived by Russo (2007, 199–208, with further bibliography). Manuwald (2001, 173–74 n. 113) surprisingly dismisses the play out of hand as "keine Praetexta."

would have been clearer for the *Aeneid*'s early audience, lie Ennius' and Naevius' *magalia*.

3. LIVY'S PUNIC *MONUMENTUM*

In the programmatic preface to his history, Livy famously makes his text into a *monumentum*: *inlustri . . . monumento*.⁶⁰ As commentators point out, in a deliberately labile play of language in the preface, there is a slippage between text and subject matter, *res*, that turns Livy's history into a virtual physical memorial: in John Moles' words, "[t]he monumentum . . . is also Livy's *Ab urbe condita* itself."⁶¹ When he comes to the Third Decade on the Hannibalic War, Livy—in another programmatic preface—describes the Second Punic War as the most memorable part of his monumental history, and indeed, of all of history: *bellum maxime omnium memorabile, quae umquam gesta sint me scripturum* ("I am about to write about the most memorable war that has ever been fought," 21.1.1).⁶² Part of the purpose of Livy's history is to bring Carthage as an ideological fantasy to the fore of Roman consciousness, to erect a textual monument that, like a newly gilded statue, would become part of its memory landscape. One reason for this is articulated by Livy's Hannibal himself. Looking forward to Roman victory, Hannibal predicts disaster not only for the defeated, but for the victors: "No great state can rest for long. If it does not have an enemy abroad, it finds one at home, as superlatively powerful bodies seem safe from outside but are burdened by their own strength [*suis ipsa viribus onerantur*]" (30.44.8). This image of Rome burdened by its own strength looks back intertextually to the preface to Book 1 and Livy's diagnosis of contemporary Rome there as "a long-powerful people . . . destroying itself by its own strength" (*vires se ipsae conficiunt*, 1 *praef.* 4).⁶³ Linked in antiquity with *monere*, part of the etymologically determined function of a *monumentum* is to warn: in a *metus hostilis* mode of thought, the Punic enemy is seen as necessary to ward off the self-destruction of civil war.⁶⁴ Though in the language of images in the the Forum, Naulochus and Mylae were set up by Rome's *princeps* as historically equivalent, it is civil war, in the end, that Augustus' column celebrated. Sextus Pompey is not the same sort of enemy as Carthage, and for Livy, though Carthage had been long defeated, bringing the ideological fantasy to the minds of his readers is imperative: with its almost physical solidity, Livy's monument will shore up the collapsing edifice of the Roman state.⁶⁵

In producing his monument to the Second Punic War, however, Livy, like his poetic contemporaries, necessarily takes on Ennius. There is much more of the *Annales* than tends to be acknowledged behind the Third Decade. Ennius' epic was still an educational text when Livy was writing, and commanded substantial

60. Moles 1993, esp. 142–44; Kraus 1994; Jaeger 1997, 15–29; Levene 2010, 390.

61. Moles 1993, 153.

62. On the etymological links in antiquity between *memoria*, *monumentum*, and *monere*, see Varro *Ling.* 6.49, with Suerbaum 1968, 327–28.

63. The *topos* is found in other Augustan authors, including Hor. *Epod.* 16.1–2; Prop. 3.13.60; cf. also Lucan 1.71–42.

64. See n. 62, above; cf. Levene 2010, 12.

65. Cf. Moles 1993.

cultural capital as the repository of Roman *memoria*, especially for this period of history.⁶⁶ Though an epic it might be, Ennius' poem was a historical epic, in Latin, and for most literate people it would have been among the first examples they were exposed to, and indeed a text they would have partially memorized, of scripted historical memory. The partial hexameter that opens *Ab urbe condita* programmatically echoes the *Annales*.⁶⁷ Toward the end of the Third Decade, Livy mentions Ennius explicitly (30.26.9, the only poet he names, and the only named writer in the Third Decade).⁶⁸ Books 21 and 22 are shot through with the permutations of one of Ennius' most famous lines, *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* (*Ann.* 363), a line that was seared into Roman memory, *versus ille* quoted and misquoted from Augustus' private letter to Tiberius, to Cicero, Virgil, and Ovid, becoming the characterizing phrase of the battle tactics used by Fabius "Cunctator."⁶⁹ Quite how much of Ennius' original text lies behind *Ab urbe condita* is now impossible to say, not least because Livy preferred to keep literary allusions covert.⁷⁰ Attempting to use Livy's text as an optimistic "source" of reconstructive material will not help us recover that material, even though it is tempting to see, for example, a rogue hexameter describing the heroic actions of Sempronius Tuditanus after Cannae, a classically Ennian *unus homo*, unsheathing his sword to break through Carthaginian troops (*haec ubi dicta dedit, stringit gladium cuneoque / facto per medios vadit hostes*, "uttering these words, he formed a column and rushed through the midst of the enemy," 22.50.10), either as a "lost" Ennian line, or, like the opening of *Ab urbe condita*, a hexameter deliberately embedded in Livy's new prose history to highlight on a metatextual level its competition with historical epic.⁷¹ In the end, the boundary between a historiographical monument and a historical epic one is not as clear-cut as might be believed, and, like Horace or Virgil, a new Augustan text on Carthage and the Punic Wars must necessarily negotiate or reuse material from the textual statue gallery—whose main attraction was *pater Ennius*—already standing in Rome.⁷²

Despite, or perhaps even because of, its obliteration by Rome in 146 BCE, Carthage was an "undead city" in Roman memory, lying between material fact and ideological fantasy. On a material level, from the center to the periphery, Carthage and its history played a key role in the spatial politics of Augustan Rome, while its crucial position in the Roman imaginary meant that the Punic-themed

66. Goldschmidt 2013, 24–26, 28–35.

67. With *facturusne operae pretium* (*Livy praef.* 1.1), see *audire est operae pretium* (*Ann.* 494), with Moles 1993, 141–43 and Prinzen 1998, 321.

68. Levene 2010, 88.

69. See Elliott 2009; Levene 2010, 89. Though, as Levene (2010, 91) notes, there is "a constant and inevitable danger . . . that we will privilege those texts which are most familiar to us, rather than those read by the author and his audience," both significantly underplay the probability of the broader impact of the Ennian dimension in the Third Decade. On the afterlife of the line, see Stanton 1971. Ennius might have been the originator of Fabius' nickname: Skutsch 1985, 531.

70. See Levene 2010, 91 on the "rarity with which he quotes overtly the literature to which he is alluding."

71. For the *Quellenforschung*, see Norden 1915, 141 n. 1 (after Hug); Skutsch 1985, 780–81 (*haec ubi dicta = vestigia frag.* v Skutsch). For other speculations, see Aly 1936, 39.

72. Cf. Moles 1993, 155: "It is . . . exceedingly likely that in characterising his work as an imperishable monumentum (*pr.* 10, 6), Livy is imitating—and trumping—Ennius' claims for his *Annales*." For a comparative study of the allusive techniques deployed in Livy's historiography and Ennius' *Annales*, see Elliott 2015.

texts of the so-called archaic canon commanded a monolithic position in Rome's textual politics. Faced with competition from the memorial urban landscape on the one hand, and the textual monuments of the archaic canon on the other, Augustan writers constructed their own *monumenta* to Carthage, incorporating within them traces of the literary past. With the ability to see beyond Naevius and Ennius, who could foresee neither the total destruction of Carthage nor the rebuilding of the city from its salty ashes in the future, these textual monuments aimed to outlast their multimedia rivals. In the end, the material culture of commemoration is now largely lost; Ennius and Naevius lie in *disiecta membra*, but the Augustan textual monuments to the Punic past, from Horace's bronze to Virgil's marble, still stand.

Durham University

LITERATURE CITED

- Aly, Wolfgang. 1936. *Livius und Ennius: Von römischer Art*. Leipzig.
- Austin, R. G., ed. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*. Oxford.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1996. Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*. *ClAnt* 15: 5–47.
- . 1997. Ecphrasis. In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. Charles Martindale, 271–81. Cambridge.
- Barchiesi, Marino. 1962. *Nevio epico*. Padua.
- Beck, Hans. 2006. Cannae—traumatische Erinnerung. In *Erinnerungsorte der Antike: Der römische Welt*, ed. Elke Stein-Hölkeskamp and Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, 204–18. Munich.
- Biggs, Thomas. Forthcoming. A Second First Punic War: (Re)spliation of Republican Naval Monuments in the Urban and Poetic Landscapes of Augustan Rome.
- Brizzi, Giovanni. 2011. Carthage and Hannibal in Roman and Greek Memory. In *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, ed. Dexter Hoyos, 483–98. Oxford.
- Bücher, Frank. 2006. *Verargumentierte Geschichte: Exempla Romana im politischen Diskurs der späten römischen Republik*. Stuttgart.
- Carcopino, Jérôme. 1919. *Virgile et les origines d'Ostie*. Paris.
- Courtney, Edward, ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Deman, Albert. 1962. Virgile et la colonisation romaine en Afrique du Nord. In *Hommages à A. Grenier*, ed. Marcel Renard, 1: 514–26. Paris.
- Elliott, Jackie. 2009. Ennius' 'Cunctator' and the History of a Gerund in the Roman Historiographical Tradition. *CQ* 50: 532–42.
- . 2015. The Epic Vantage-Point: Roman Historiographical Allusion Reconsidered. *Histos* 9: 277–311.
- Fabrizi, Virginia. 2008. Ennio e l'*aedes Herculis Musarum*. *Athenaeum* 96: 193–219.
- Galinsky, Karl. 2009. Aeneas at Cumae. *Vergilius* 55: 69–87.
- Giusti, Elena. 2014. *The Enemy on Stage: Augustan Revisionism and the Punic Wars in Virgil's "Aeneid"*. Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge.
- . Forthcoming. Virgil's Carthage: A Heterotopic Space of Empire. In *Imagining Spaces of Empire in Hellenistic Greek and Roman Literature*, ed. Markus Asper and Victoria Rimell. Heidelberg.
- Goldberg, Sander M. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Goldschmidt, Nora. 2013. *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' "Annales" and Virgil's "Aeneid"*. Oxford.
- Gros, Pierre. 1990. Le premier urbanisme de la Colonia Julia Carthago: Mythes et réalités d'une fondation césaro-augustéenne. *L'Afrique dans l'Occident Romain. CEFR* 134: 547–73.

- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- . 1992. Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome. In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, ed. Anton Powell, 59–82. Bristol.
- . 2006. Virgil's Ptolemaic Relations. *JRS* 96: 25–41.
- . 2012. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge.
- Harrison, E. L. 1984. The *Aeneid* and Carthage. In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, ed. Tony Woodman and David West, 95–115. Cambridge.
- Harrison, Stephen J. 1990. The Praise Singer: Horace, Censorinus and *Odes* 4.8. *JRS* 80: 31–43.
- Heslin, Peter. 2015. *The Museum of Augustus: The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin Poetry*. Los Angeles.
- Hills, P. D. 2001. Ennius, Suetonius and the Genesis of Horace, *Odes* 4. *CQ* 51: 613–16.
- Hinds, Stephen. 1998 *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim. 2006. History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic. In *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, ed. Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx, 478–95. Oxford.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 1985. Illusion and Reality in Latin Topographical Writing. *GaR* 32: 197–208.
- Hurst, Henry R. 1985. Fouilles britanniques au Port circulaire et quelques idées sur le développement de la Carthage romaine. *CahÉtAnc* 17: 143–56.
- Jaeger, Mary. 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Kießling, Adolf, and Richard Heinze, eds. 1958. *Q. Horatius Flaccus*⁹. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Kondratieff, Eric. 2004. The Column and Coinage of C. Duilius: Innovations in Iconography in Large and Small Media in the Middle Republic. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23: 1–39.
- Kraus, Christina S. 1994. 'No Second Troy': Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V. *TAPA* 124: 267–89.
- Krevans, Nita. 1993. Ilia's Dream: Ennius, Virgil, and the Mythology of Seduction. *HSPH* 95: 257–71.
- Levene, D. S. 2010. *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford.
- Mác Goráin, Fiachra. 2013. Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic. In *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, ed. Joseph Farrell and Damien P. Nelis, 124–45. Oxford.
- Manuwald, Gesine. 2001. *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. Munich.
- Martelli, Francesca. Forthcoming. Ennius' *imago* between Tomb and Text. In *Tombs of the Ancient Poets: Between Text and Material Culture*, ed. Nora Goldschmidt and Barbara Graziosi.
- Miles, Richard. 2003. Rivalling Rome: Carthage. In *Rome the Cosmopolis*, ed. Catharine Edwards and Greg Woolf, 123–46. Cambridge.
- Moles, John. 1993. Livy's Preface. *PCPS* 39: 141–68.
- Morgan, Llewelyn. 2014. A Metrical Scandal in Ennius. *CQ* 64: 152–59.
- Norden, Eduard. 1915. *Ennius und Vergilius: Kriegsbilder aus Roms großer Zeit*. Leiden.
- O'Gorman, Ellen. 2004. Cato the Elder and the Destruction of Carthage. *Helios* 31.1–2: 91–125.
- Pobjoy, Mark. 1998. Dido on the Tragic Stage: An Invitation to the Theatre of Carthage. In *A Woman Scorn'd: Responses to the Dido Myth*, ed. Michael Burden, 41–64. London.
- Powell, Anton. 2008. *Virgil the Partisan: A Study in the Re-integration of Classics*. Swansea.
- Prinzen, Herbert. 1998. *Ennius im Urteil der Antike*. Stuttgart.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 1995. On the Sacking of Carthage and Corinth. In *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Doreen Innes, Harry Hine, and Christopher Pelling, 133–48. Oxford.
- Quinn, Kenneth, ed. 1980. *Horace: The "Odes."* London.
- Quint, David. 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Homer to Milton*. Princeton, N.J.

- Rakob, Friedrich. 2000. The Making of Augustan Carthage. In *Romanization and the City: Creation, Transformations, and Failures*, ed. Elizabeth Fentress. 73–82. JRA supp. 38. Portsmouth.
- Reed, J. D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the "Aeneid."* Princeton, N.J.
- Roller, Matthew. 2009. The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, ed. Andrew Feldherr, 214–30. Cambridge.
- . 2013. On the Intersignification of Monuments in Augustan Rome. *AJP* 134: 119–31.
- Rossi, Andreola. 2000. The Tears of Marcellus: History of a Literary Motif in Livy. *GaR* 47: 56–66.
- Russo, Alessandro, ed. 2007. *Quinto Ennio: Le opere minori*. Pisa.
- Shi, Veronica S.-R., and Llewelyn Morgan. 2015. A Tale of Two Carthages: History and Allusive Topography in Virgil's Libyan Harbour (*Aen.* 1.159–69). *TAPA* 105: 107–33.
- Skutsch, Otto, ed. 1985. *The "Annales" of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Stabryła, Stanisław. 1970. *Latin Tragedy in Virgil's Poetry*. Warsaw.
- Stanton, G. R. 1971. *Cunctando restituit rem*: The Tradition about Fabius. *Antichthon* 5: 49–56.
- Suerbaum, Werner. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.
- , ed. 2002. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*. Vol. 1, *Die archaische Literatur: Von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 8.1. Munich.
- Vahlen, Johannes, ed. 1903. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- Walter, Uwe. 2004. *Memoria und res publica: Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Watson, Lindsay C., ed. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's "Epodes."* Oxford.
- Wigodsky, Michael. 1972. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Hermes Einzelschriften 24. Wiesbaden.
- Thomas, Richard F., ed. 2011. *Horace: "Odes" Book IV and "Carmen Saeculare."* Cambridge.
- Wightman, Edith Mary. 1980. The Plan of Roman Carthage: Practicalities and Politics. In *New Light on Ancient Carthage*, ed. John Griffiths Pedley, 29–46. Ann Arbor, Mich.